

REMARKS

Favorable Reconsideration and Allowance of the Present Application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-26 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 27-34 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 24, and 27 are independent.

INTERVIEW & DISCUSSIONS CONDUCTED

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with the Applicant's representative on December 13, 2004 as well as conducting subsequent telephonic discussions to promote the prosecution of the application. As the Examiner indicated during the discussions, the features of (1) retrying of the refresh and polling requests, and (2) clarifying the definitions of input and output types of secondary stations overcome all cited prior art individually or in any combination.

Independent claims have all been amended as necessary.

In addition, claim 27, a newly added independent claim, also include the features stated above.

§ 103 REJECTION – ILG, GILBERT

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ilg et al. (US Patent 4,829,297, hereinafter “Ilg”) in view of Gilbert et al. (US Patent 5,297,144, hereinafter “Gilbert”).

As noted above, independent claims 1, 11, 16 and 21 have been amended to overcome all cited prior art of record including Ilg and Gilbert. Therefore, these independent claims are distinguishable over the combination of Ilg and Gilbert. Claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20, and 22-26 depend from these independent claims, directly or indirectly. Therefore, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Ilg and Gilbert.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-26 based on Ilg and Gilbert be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – ILG, GILBERT, DAVIS

Claims 5 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ilg in view of Gilbert and in further view of Davis et al. (USPN 4,363,093, hereinafter “Davis”).

It is noted that claims 5 and 19 depend from independent claims 1 and 16, and it has been shown above that claims 1 and 16 are distinguishable over any combination of the cited prior art including Ilg, Gilbert and Davis. Thus,

for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 5 and 19 are also distinguishable over the combination of Ilg, Gilbert and Davis.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 19 based on Ilg, Gilbert and Davis be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 27-34 have been added through this reply. All new claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in any combination. Applicants respectfully request that the new claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

U.S. Application No. 09/764,299

Docket No. 2565-0221P

January 19, 2005

Art Unit: 2157

Page 18 of 18

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter

Reg. No. 29,680

HNS

MKM/HNS
2565-0221P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000